

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements—Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

MONDAY, AUGUST 30, 1920.

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation, Office: 120, West 43rd St., New York City. Vice-President: Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary: R. E. Maxfield, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3600.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By mail, including postage, in the United States:
 East of Mississippi River: One Year, \$12.00; Six Months, \$7.00; Three Months, \$4.00.
 By Mail, Postpaid: One Year, \$12.00; Six Months, \$7.00; Three Months, \$4.00.
 Daily only, 10¢.
 One week, 50¢.
 Sunday only, 10¢.
 Sunday only, 10¢.
FOREIGN RATES:
 Daily and Sunday, \$24.00; Six Months, \$12.00; Three Months, \$7.00.
 Daily only, 10¢.
 Sunday only, 10¢.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTY.
 You can purchase our circulation advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.
 The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of appearance of this publication herein. All rights of reproduction of all other matter herein are reserved.

The B. R. T. "Outlaws"

This city has another "outlaw" transportation strike on its hands. The radicals in the B. R. T. union have tied up the system in defiance of their contracts and of the rules of their own organization.

The same capacious and violent spirit that was manifested in the "outlaw" railroad strikes is in evidence here. Commissioner Delaney and Mayor Hylan, who were acting as mediators, urged the men not to strike. Both said that Judge Mayer was right in his interpretation of his duty as the guardian of a property in receivership. P. J. Shea, the chairman of the international organization to which the B. R. T. employees belong, took exception to that view. But he wanted the issue to be settled in an orderly way. He denounced the snap strike action taken by a group of radicals without a record vote. "This strike is illegal," he said to those who ordered it. "The international will declare you outlaws."

Mayor Hylan said frankly to the men: "This is no time to have strikes. The public is sick and tired of strikes." It is heartily sick and tired of hold-ups of necessary community activities at the whim of arbitrary minority groups. The strikers say to the public: "If we can't have our way, irrespective of our own obligations and of the rights of those with whom we have signed contracts, none of you can go to your daily work." The great majority must submit to loss and inconvenience to suit the caprice of a tiny lawless minority.

Strikes of this sort are a form of civil war—and guerrilla war at that. They are directed less at employers than at the right of the public to go unmolested about its own affairs. Public opinion suppressed the "outlaw" railroad strikes. It will show its power again in defeating the attempted blockade of Brooklyn's transportation lines.

"The Poor Man's Lawyer"

In his address before the American Bar Association Mr. Hughes advocated the establishment on a large scale of legal aid societies. It is his idea that the work of Americanization can be helped along by instrumentalities which bring the alien into more sympathetic contact with the courts, in which he generally feels himself a mute and pathetic cipher. Most aliens distrust American justice because they don't understand its processes. They don't appreciate the necessity of having good legal advice and generally fall into the hands of incompetent and bungling attorneys. They come out of court thinking that justice is a lottery and that the rich man, who can employ the best legal talent, has an unfair advantage over the poor man.

Litigation is costly and cumbersome, and the poor, whether alien or native, have at present too little experience with the boasted evenhandedness of justice. Agencies which will protect them in their rights, for the sake of having the right prevail, and charge them nothing for the service, offer them a new and startling illumination on the workings of American democracy.

The state makes laws, but compels the rich and the poor, the weak and the strong, to battle out of their own means to secure judgment. Mr. Hughes believes that the poor man's handicap ought to be lifted, not through state assistance but through the patriotic labor of private organizations. "The legal aid society is the poor man's lawyer and gives him the essential assistance he cannot obtain elsewhere."

The pertinency of these suggestions is emphasized by the housing situation here. How could the average tenant, trying to obtain the benefit of the new rent laws, expect to contend single-handed against the landlord's highly paid lawyers? The rent laws would probably break down, so far as the poorer tenants are concerned, were it not for the intervention of friendly advisers. The district political organizations of this city are now making a specialty of providing free counsel for tenants and arranging for the presentation of rent cases in the municipal courts. Yet it is a dubious practice for the political organizations, which practically name judges to act as legal defenders of one class of litigants.

Legal aid societies, intent not on doing favors to voters but on having the law executed impartially, would be a better recourse. No greater civic service is open to lawyers and high-minded citizens than organization to secure the needy and ignorant full protection under the law.

Selling Our Surplus Abroad

This country has been without an adequate merchant marine for 30 many years, and such a large proportion of American products have been consumed within our own borders, that many do not fully realize how important it is to develop our foreign trade and to carry it in American ships as far as possible. Yet upon a steady and considerable increase in export business depends to not a little extent the prosperity of almost every individual in the United States—those living in the interior as well as those residing near a seacoast; farmers, ranchmen, miners, as well as factory operatives.

Modern machinery and modern methods have served to multiply production in practically all fields. At present abnormal conditions prevail, with shortage in many directions. But before the war upset everything and everybody, to greater or less extent, it was estimated that by running full blast during eight or nine months American industries could produce all the goods the American people would consume in a full year. Largely because of this shut-downs occurred now and then, with idle workmen and loss of wages. Hard times recurred periodically. But it should be remembered that very seldom, under normal conditions, do "hard times" prevail simultaneously all over the world. As has been said by P. H. W. Ross, of the National Mercantile Marine League, "Somewhere the sun is always shining."

If this country, in normal times, really does produce during part of the year enough goods to supply its needs for a full year, then in order to prevent shut-downs due to lack of domestic demand, and to insure steady work and steady wages through the whole twelve months, American business men will have to develop markets in other lands where "the sun is shining," although it may be temporarily obscured here at home. As far as expedient, American ships should carry the cargoes, preferably insured by American companies. The time has gone by for our exporters to be almost wholly dependent in these matters upon foreign competitors. All that American business asks is a fair field and no favor.

The Hog and His Feed

In an address before the National Association of Retail Meat Dealers, Henry C. Wallace, editor of Wallace's Farmer and one of the country's leading livestock authorities, presented interesting facts concerning hog production and prices. Measuring hogs not in dollars, but in bushels of corn, and pointing out that it takes 11.5 bushels of No. 2 corn to make 100 pounds of hog, Mr. Wallace then compares the average price on the Chicago market of 11.5 bushels of No. 2 corn with the average price of 100 pounds of hog. His inquiry extends back to 1860, and he presents the results in chart form. The sixty years show a steady swing back and forth across the line of equality of return for the 11.5 bushels of corn and the 100 pounds of hog.

The movement is amazing in the regularity of its rhythm. During thirty of the sixty years it has paid to sell corn, and during thirty years it has paid to feed the corn to the hog. The swing in favor of the corn lasts approximately two years, and the succeeding swing in favor of the hog the same time. The changes come with almost the precision of the tides. Not in a long time has there been such a visible demonstration of the inflexible action of the natural laws of industry and trade.

Producers and economists have talked of this or that special cause as affecting relative prices, but the controlling influence has been the fact that the farmer has gone in for hogs when it paid to feed and has invariably overdone the business, creating a condition which drove corn prices up and hog prices down.

But, although the time is divided practically evenly, the swings against hogs have been sharper and have gone further than those against corn. Thus in 1917 100 pounds of hog could be sold for \$3 more than 11.5 bushels of corn could be sold for. But early in 1918 the 100 pounds of hog brought \$5 less than 11.5 bushels of corn. In late 1919 hogs were \$2 per 100 pounds better than the corn, but in 1920 11.5 bushels of corn in the warehouse were worth \$6 more than the same corn in a hog.

Another striking feature of the chart is the similarity between the present period and that following the Civil War. In 1864, with reference to corn, hogs per 100 pounds were \$5 below par, whereas in 1866 they were \$6.50 above it. Using the chart as a basis for prophecy, it would seem clear, to use the lan-

guage of the produce market, that corn is a good sale and pork a good buy. The present "spread" between them is abnormal and the equalizing movement is already in progress.

Another inference, and a most important one, is to be drawn from the investigations of Mr. Wallace. This is that we do not need to worry about the farmer charging too much. Whatever may be true of other industries, into which artificial combinations enter, the agricultural industry is one of free competition. A farmer is unable to profiteer, because other farmers won't let him. The fact that combination, except in a few specialties, is non-existent in agriculture should never be forgotten when legislation concerning the agricultural interest is under consideration.

The Silk Shirt Habit

Under many circumstances thrift is not merely a virtue but a necessity. During the war, when there was need for all the productive power not engaged in providing for simple living, this necessity existed. How the people responded to the need is one of the most gratifying parts of the war record. It is not gratifying that in the reaction from self-denial extravagance came, but neither is it in the least surprising. Having saved hard during the war, it was to be expected that people should spend freely when the opportunity arrived. Whatever economists think they should do, Americans as a rule save only when they must and spend when they can. We are not a thrifty nation, in the Old World sense; we haven't had to be.

But because we do not pare the potatoes quite as closely as do the Europeans; because many wear silk stockings and silk shirts; because we buy \$10 shoes and press them on the clutch pedals of automobiles; because of all our so-called extravagances—does it follow that we are headed straight for ruin? We don't think so. Quite the contrary. We think it all means that we are still headed in the right direction—toward a higher standard of living. It is true, of course, that the thing has been overdone, and so a reaction is foreseeable—is, indeed, taking place. But that is mainly because most of us took too much of one of the products of work—leisure. Money came so easily that most of us slacked more or less, and presently there weren't enough things to go round; prices became fantastic and a break became unavoidable.

But, believing as we do that there is nothing immoral in the desire for silk stockings and shirts and automobiles; that, instead, enlarging desires make for progress and for a higher standard of living, it seems to us that the taste which people have had of luxuries will stimulate a determination to have them always, and so in the end be beneficial.

Words of wonderment are heard about the fact that people who actually work with their hands have been buying silk shirts! Well, what of it? May every worker in the country own all the silk shirts his heart desires. May every factory girl have a ribbon for her hair. We don't live on bread alone. The worker can have his silk shirt and the girl her ribbon. And they can have them, too, we are certain, if only they will work hard enough. Just now, perhaps, they want to get them without hard work, but that is a passing phase. Presently all will settle down and get what they want by giving full work for it. Of course, it may take time to reach this mood, but we will get there one way or another.

And the boom that will follow will be a thing to see!

The Pay Envelope

Was not a great domestic problem touched upon somewhat too lightly by Justice Preschi when he advised a prisoner before the court not to give his pay to his wife, but to put it in the savings bank? In this case, to be sure, the wife had run away, taking the money with her, and it would clearly have been more satisfactory for the husband had he been less generous. But whether a man should turn over his weekly envelope to the partner of his joys and sorrows is a question that even a judicial *obiter dictum* can hardly answer off-hand. As Mr. Spectator told Sir Roger de Coverley, there is much to be said on both sides. It will have to be admitted in these days of equal suffrage that a wife is no pensioner on the bounty of her husband. Her concern in the common life is just as great as his, and her authority should be just as great. His money is hers, even though it be paid to him. As housekeeper she is, in fact, a partial earner. There was never any justice in the practice of doling out the household expenses to a wife as if she were a child who did not know enough to spend it wisely. Humiliation of this sort is one of the quickest ways to wedded misery. That a wife should have a proper allowance is now a generally accepted proposition. And in households of the humbler sort the turning over of the pay envelope has become the symbol of due submission to the mistress.

Yet there is such a thing as masculine independence and self-respect, too, as Justice Preschi doubtless desired to point out. A man who

turns his whole pay over to his wife and accepts from her humbly what she thinks he is entitled to spend on carfare and tobacco is in no position to assert the authority which properly belongs to the head of the family. If woman has too long been domestically oppressed that is no reason why she should turn oppressor. The French have the right idea. A true partnership is the only reasonable surety of wedded happiness.

Jews and the League

Eventual Admission of Palestine Is Planned For

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: On the basis of a brief dispatch relating to the attitude of the Jews toward the League of Nations, and the purport of which is not entirely clear, Rabbi Isaac Landman has rushed into print to denounce the Committee of Jewish Delegations in Paris and to make declarations in behalf of the American Jews.

The reported decision of the Committee of Jewish Delegations evidently has to do with the national Jewish aspirations, centering around the idea now in process of realization, pertaining to the reestablishment of the Jewish homeland in Palestine.

Naturally, the Jews in Palestine and the nationalist Jewish leaders abroad, like the spokesmen of other rehabilitated nationalities, look toward the League of Nations as the great moral influence of the world in the future, and even the peoples not yet fully set up in nationhood already aspire for a seat in the league which they hope will in the course of time be granted them. For the rest, it seems fairer to await a definite and authoritative statement with regard to this decision before launching upon criticism and denunciation.

Mr. Landman's statement with regard to the standing of the committee of delegations is one-sided. It is true that the committee is an outgrowth of the delegation from the American Jewish Congress, and of the delegations elected by popular assemblies and large organizations in other lands, with a view of bringing the Jewish claims before the peace conference. But after the conclusion of these labors before the peace conference conditions arose which made it necessary for the delegations in Paris to continue in session, and the continued activities have been carried on with the sanction of the constituent organizations and other bodies in the different lands.

Though the treaties have been signed and the Jewish claims with regard to the homeland in Palestine and minority rights for the Jews of Eastern Europe have been fully recognized by the Allied and associated powers, the continued conditions of disorder and warfare in Europe, the new outbursts of fanaticism and racial hatred in the form of pogroms, and the tendency of some of the new and enlarged states to ignore the clauses in the treaties safeguarding the lives and property of minorities, have necessitated the making of further presentations to the governments and appeals to the conscience of civilization, and the Committee of Jewish Delegations has therefore extended its labors beyond the temporary needs required by the peace conference.

This has been done not only with the sanction of affiliated organizations, but with the moral approval of the Jewish masses in the various lands, who are anxious about the welfare of their brethren in the still unsettled and disturbed regions. For the same reason the American Jewish Congress, formed originally for wartime purposes, is now being reorganized with a view of carrying on further labors for the protection of the rights and promotion of the welfare of our harassed people abroad.

Pending the completion of the reorganization, the 400 delegates to the former congress, representing the leading national and central organizations, and over 200 communities in the different cities of the country, have, with the consent of their constituencies, assumed the duty of cooperating with the Committee of Jewish Delegations in Paris in meeting any new emergencies and in furthering the aims of securing justice for the Jews everywhere. The Provisional Organization for the American Jewish Congress is headed by Mr. Nathan Straus, and has among its other officers Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Max Mitchell, Morris Rothenberg, Abraham S. Schomer, Mrs. Mary Fels and the heads of a number of leading organizations whose views and position in the community are well known.

BERNARD G. RICHARDS, Executive Secretary, Provisional Organization for the Formation of American Jewish Congress. New York, Aug. 25, 1920.

Pacifist Pedantry

To the Editor of The Tribune.
 Sir: The pedant of the White House has outdone himself. He says, in effect: "Poles, don't pursue the retreat! Red's into Russian territory. Stop at the border and give 'em a chance to come back at you again!"

Suppose the Poles should say to us, in the event of a raid by Mexican bandits: "Chase them to the border but stop there. Don't invade Mexican territory!"

I hope the Poles will no more heed impudent, unjustified dictation from the White House than we should similar dictation from Warsaw.

DISGUSTED.
 Milford, Pa., Aug. 27, 1920.

The Reign of Virtue

(From The Boston Evening Transcript)
 With prohibition and equal suffrage in the Constitution, Uncle Sam will no longer have the shadow of an excuse for not being good.

A Strong Inducement

(From The Pittsburgh Gazette-Times)
 Since it costs more to travel to-day perhaps more will want to do it.

The Conning Tower

BI-CENTENARY

(Circa 1900)

TO-DAY the village yields a lively scene. The hitching-bars are filled along the green, and in the sheds behind the draped town hall.

Unbridled, plucky horses fill each stall. From well across the York State line, they say, The crowd has flocked to keep this holiday—

The third and last day of a celebration. The village holds to honor its foundation.

This afternoon a pageant will be played; The morning witnesses a street parade.

With floats and trappings and the Foot Guards band. Along the route of march folk take their stand.

Craning their necks and shuffling with their feet And making hackneyed comments on the heat;

While murmurs rise again and yet again, "What are they waiting for? It's half-past ten!"

"What are we waiting for?"—so query, too, Village performers at the rendezvous.

Among them pouts the comely, conscious maid. In hoops and frock of treasured silk brocade;

This stoutheaded matron with the Gainsborough curl And touch of rouge is for to-day a girl;

With peg-tops, beaver and plum-colored coat A local banker struts. Thus one may note

How bodied forth in many forms appears The story of the hamlet through the years.

All figures of the past, save one, we scan: Where, pray, is he with whom the tale began?

Old Chris is wanting—Chris, who far and wide Plods with his baskets through the countryside.

Unpacking at back doors his dextrous wares, While the unclivil rustic grins and stares

And bargains (wily soul, he knows full well That Yankee shops have none so good to sell!)

Old Indian Chris, selected to present An ancient sashem for this gay event,

With paint and feathers, tomahawk and bow— For him they wait, they seek him high and low;

But at the last Old Chris has slipped away. They seek in vain—he will not march to-day.

From Redmen once the village founders bought These ample lands for somewhat less than nought.

To Redmen commonly three things they gave: The white man's Bible, rum, a welcome grave.

But not the grasp of friendship. In their eyes, A Redman was a being to despise

And dupe—at most, perhaps, to tolerate; A creature wedded to his heathen state;

Who, spite of priestly threats, would still persist In not becoming Congregationalist.

Their plows and harrows, after he had died, Without compunction spurned his bones aside.

Why should Old Chris, then, help to glorify Their very undistinguished deeds, and why

Should Chris go marching in a hot parade When he may linger in the tavern's shade?

Pass on, you paleface show, with flourish pass— Leave Chris the shabby solace of his glass!

G. S. B.

Etymology always has fascinated us. Ossowetz, which the Poles have taken, gets its name, we suppose, from Ossobone; and Wetz, dry; Bone-dry.

Now, when one turns to the Bolshevik strategy, it is plain that there is more than a suggestion of German.

The whole Russian operation was comprehended in a double thrust on both flanks—toward Warsaw in the north, toward Lemberg in the south. It is clear, too, that the Poles, like the French, misjudged the direction of the main thrust and concentrated their best troops, not covering their capital, but in Galicia, which corresponds to Lorraine in 1914.

As a result the northern forces of the Poles were overwhelmed and the Bolsheviks rushed in upon Warsaw.

Unlike the Germans, too, they were able to extend their front. Thus, while Kluck was not able to reach the Seine west of Paris and cut off the capital from the coast, the Bolsheviks did penetrate the Danzig corridor and cut the Danzig railway. Warsaw was thus momentarily isolated from the outside world.

Precisely as Joffre drew upon his Lorraine armies to reconstitute his Paris flank, the Poles now drew upon their Galician armies. In each case a counter offensive was intended, but in the Polish case the attack was delivered, not as at the Marne, against the right, but the left flank of the forces facing the capital. Maunoury in 1914 actually employed the Schlieffen maneuver against the Germans, but Pilsudski, obviously advised by Weyand,

Far apart as the Poles, probably. F. P. A.

THE GREAT UNREST

Copyright, 1920, New York Tribune Inc.



The Marne and the Vistula

By Frank H. Simonds

The unmistakable resemblance of the results of the recent battle of the Vistula to those of the First Battle of the Marne have led to not a few attempts to establish between the two a strategic resemblance. On the whole, however, it is clear that there are differences almost as great as the similarities.

The Marne campaign, on the German side, was dominated by the Schlieffen conception of bringing off in northern France something resembling Hannibal's achievement at the Battle of Cannae. The two wings of the German host, one advancing through Belgium, the other through Lorraine, were to envelop the Allied armies, surround and capture them. The essential detail was the superiority in German numbers obtained by the incorporation of reserves with active formations. It was failure to foresee this which led to French misfortunes, because only by such an expression of numbers were the Germans able to extend their front far enough west to envelop the British and French in Belgium.

Nevertheless, Joffre's retreat enabled the western armies of the Allies to escape from one arm of the German embrace, while French victories in Lorraine definitely arrested the other arm. By the end of August Moltke was forced to recognize that envelopment was no longer possible, and he sought to substitute a double movement attack upon Paris by the armies of Kluck and Bülow and on the French center by those of Hausen and Württemberg.

But Kluck, deliberately disobeying Moltke's orders, adventured south of the Marne and opened his flank to French troops in Paris. In doing this he was still adhering to the original "Cannae" conception. This Kluck maneuver opened the way for the French thrust out of Paris by Maunoury's army, but Kluck, perceiving the peril, reacted with amazing swiftness and promptly checked the Maunoury attack upon his flank. Unhappily for him, however, to stop Maunoury he had to remove all his masses from the British front and open a gap, into which the British pressed with decisive consequence by September 9.

Now, when one turns to the Bolshevik strategy, it is plain that there is more than a suggestion of German. The whole Russian operation was comprehended in a double thrust on both flanks—toward Warsaw in the north, toward Lemberg in the south. It is clear, too, that the Poles, like the French, misjudged the direction of the main thrust and concentrated their best troops, not covering their capital, but in Galicia, which corresponds to Lorraine in 1914.

As a result the northern forces of the Poles were overwhelmed and the Bolsheviks rushed in upon Warsaw. Unlike the Germans, too, they were able to extend their front. Thus, while Kluck was not able to reach the Seine west of Paris and cut off the capital from the coast, the Bolsheviks did penetrate the Danzig corridor and cut the Danzig railway. Warsaw was thus momentarily isolated from the outside world.

Precisely as Joffre drew upon his Lorraine armies to reconstitute his Paris flank, the Poles now drew upon their Galician armies. In each case a counter offensive was intended, but in the Polish case the attack was delivered, not as at the Marne, against the right, but the left flank of the forces facing the capital. Maunoury in 1914 actually employed the Schlieffen maneuver against the Germans, but Pilsudski, obviously advised by Weyand,

whose relation to Foch suggests that of Berthier to Napoleon, broke through between the Russian right and center and advanced across the line of retreat of the Russian right flank, where Maunoury threatened the rear and communications of all the German armies in France.

There resulted, as at the Marne, a general dislocation of the enemy right and center. The right was compelled to retire precipitately, while the center seems to have been crushed completely and was thus unable to prevent the Polish occupation of all the territory between the Bug and the Vistula, and even the enormously important Brest-Litovsk bridgehead, on the east bank of the Bug. Only north of the Bug, between the river and the Prussian frontier, below Brest, were the Russians able to hold on briefly and make a final effort to cut Poland off from the sea.

Meanwhile, precisely as happened in the Marne time, while Pilsudski was weakening his Galician army to save his capital, drawing troops from his left to his right and center, the Bolsheviks redoubled their attacks upon his left, seeking to get Lemberg as the Germans in 1914 strove to take Nancy.

This effort is still in full swing as I write these lines. But the military effort, the loss of the Galician defenses, would be far less than the consequences Joffre would have suffered had the Eastern barrier collapsed in September, 1914.

Analogy with the Second Battle of the Marne is also more exact as to results than as to details. Mangin's thrust at the Soissons "corner" in 1918, in which American troops participated gloriously, was again like Maunoury's before Paris, an attack upon the flank and a thrust at the rear and communications of the German army fighting far to the south. But it was immediately successful, whereas Maunoury was counter attacked and almost defeated by Kluck. Mangin, on the other hand, took much ground and large numbers of prisoners, and continued to exercise a pressure which could be momentarily checked but never abolished. German retreat out of the Marne salient was always inevitable after the first hours of July 18, 1918.

The first Marne arrested German invasion and turned it back, but it did not do more than defeat the first German bid for a decision in the West. Verdun and the three attacks of 1918 were still to come. By contrast the second Marne definitely deprived the German of the initiative and started the retreat which ended only with surrender. In 1914 Joffre lacked the reserves in men and in munitions to exploit his victory. In 1918 Foch had both.

Now, it is too soon to say the Battle of the Vistula has combined the results of both Marne. It may be too soon to say that it has permanently broken the Russian power for the offensive. But, on the other hand, it is manifest that the Russian armies lack the cohesion of the French and the British troops of 1914, the power which enabled the latter to retreat for days and then suddenly to react, the quality to which Kluck ascribes the German defeat at the Marne and in the war. Disaster which does not destroy troops of the first class, completely commanded, is often fatal in armies of the sort which the Bolsheviks now possess.

Success by the Poles in reestablishing the line of the Bug and the Narw, the reoccupation of Lomza and Ostrolenka, as well as Brest-Litovsk, will at the least promise a transformation of the conflict into a war of positions.

at the Polish frontier, like that which began at the Aisne, following the German retreat from the Marne. Meantime, Russian success in Galicia, if it comes, will have a political rather than a military value, for the present, for Galicia is a subsidiary field of operations.

Any considerable Polish advance beyond the Bug and the Niemen—that is, beyond what are now called the ethnic frontiers—seems unlikely for sound military reasons, since the cause of the recent disaster was a too excessive extension of the lines of communication and a similar expansion of the front. French advisers are sure to prevent a repetition of these mistakes. What seems more likely is that, once Poland is reestablished at the north, troops will be sent to clear Galicia.

French strategy is certainly revealed in the method of the Polish counterattacks and the fashion in which weak points were established and exploited, but analogies between the Marne and the Vistula are apt to lead too far afield, when they are pressed with over-great insistence.

Copyright, 1920, McClure Newspaper Syndicate.

Covenant Mysteries

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Article III of the covenant of the league says the league is to operate "through the instrumentality of an assembly and of a council." Each of these bodies is given authority to "deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world."

What is to happen if the assembly and council differ widely in the action they take on some matter (other than a formally submitted "dispute likely to lead to a rupture," provided for in Article XV)? There is an obscurity in the league covenant on this point. While the difference of action lasts between the council and assembly, what is the duty of a nation or nations that are members of the league?

Article XV provides what is to be done in case there is a dispute between members of the league. Among other things, it says that the council "either unanimously or by a majority vote" must report the facts in dispute, with their recommendations. It also says that if the council fails to reach a report which is "unanimously agreed to by the members thereof" [other than the parties to the dispute], "the members of the league reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice." Does this mean that the members of the league are free to go ahead and act just as if there was no league at all? If so, is not the league a "rope of sand," resting for its efficiency upon the making of a unanimous report by a number of nations whose interests and national habits and temper of mind are exceedingly diverse? I have thought much over this, and am puzzled. YOUTH IN LONG TROUSERS. New York, Aug. 26, 1920.

Against Barnes and Wadsworth

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to endorse the letter of Florence McIntyre which appeared in this morning's Tribune calling attention to the inadvisability of nominating James W. Wadsworth for reelection to the United States Senate. I am a Republican of over fifty years' standing, but cannot vote for Wadsworth. I find a corresponding sentiment among a large majority of my acquaintances. Why put